UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

DESTINIE N. LEPSCH,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-1325-pp

v.

MARTIN J. O'MALLEY,

Defendant.

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYING FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 3)

The plaintiff has filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying her claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. She also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Federal law requires a person who files a complaint in federal court to pay \$405—a filing fee of \$350 (28 U.S.C. §1914(a)) and a \$55 administrative fee (Judicial Conference of the United States District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule Effective the December 1, 2023, #14). To allow the plaintiff to proceed without prepaying the filing fee, the court first must decide whether the plaintiff can pay the fee; if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Based on the facts in the plaintiff's affidavit, the court concludes that she does not have the ability to pay the filing fee. The plaintiff indicates that she is

employed, she is not married and she has no dependents she is responsible for supporting. Dkt. No. 3 at 1. The plaintiff lists monthly wages of \$262 from her employment at Festival Foods; she lists monthly expenses totaling \$225 (\$175 rent, \$50 cell phone). Id. at 2-3. The plaintiff states that she owns two vehicles, a 2012 Ram 1500, worth approximately \$4,000 and a 2009 Volkswagen Routan, worth approximately \$1,000; she says that she does not own her home or any other property of value and that she has \$200 in cash on hand or in a checking or savings account. Id. at 3-4. The plaintiff states "[I] receive food share monthly for myself my roommate's Rent is \$675 he charges me \$175 a month and that covers everything in household." Id. at 4. The plaintiff has demonstrated that she cannot pay the \$405 fee.

The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting Nietzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Casteel v. Pieschek, 3 F.3d 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner's final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. See Roddy v. Astrue, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).

The plaintiff's complaint states that she was denied benefits for lack of disability and that the Commissioner's conclusions and findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence and are contrary to federal laws and

regulations. Dkt. No. 1 at 1-2. At this early stage in the case, and based on the information in the plaintiff's complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff's appeal of the Commissioner's decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 17th day of October, 2024.

BY THE COURT:

HON. PAMELA PEPPER

Chief United States District Judge